

Results of IGPP/IGPE Survey

Jim Herring

FMSIC Meeting

July 29, 2003

General Response

- Eight laboratories responded
 - ANL, BNL, INEEL, LANL, LLNL, PNNL, and SNL, FNAL
- Other responses expected but not received
 - ORNL
- General responses support permanently adopting IGPP and IGPE

Survey Questions and Responses

- 1 To what extent have you utilized the approval by DOE to pilot IGPP and IGPE?
 - 4 Labs have used (at least in planning stage)
 - 4 Labs have not used
 - Sandia has largest number of projects
- 2 Have you found the restriction on increasing your G&A budget or rates in order to fund IGPP or IGPE to be a problem?
 - 4 Labs indicate G&A restriction has not been a problem
 - 3 Labs indicate it is a barrier
 - Size of Lab seems to be a factor

Survey Questions and Responses

3 Has your experience in funding IGPP or IGPE otherwise contributed to Laboratory objectives in a meaningful productive way?

- 3 Weapons Labs indicate positive experience with both
- PNNL has planned IGPP projects but not used IGPE
- ANL, BNL, INEEL, FNAL have not used

4 How has your use of IGPP or IGPE contributed to your CAS compliance efforts?

- 3 Weapons Labs say it is more fair, not necessarily a CAS problem
- PNNL has limited experience but sees it as fair
- Other Labs haven't used

Survey Questions and Responses

- 5 Have you experienced any difficulty in restricting IGPP and IGPE to non-programmatic/institutional purposes?
 - 4 Labs indicate there have been no problems
 - 4 Labs replied N/A
- 6 Did you find that your Landlord program already provided sufficient GPP or capital equipment funding and that IGPP and IGPE were not necessary?
 - General answer to this question is No
 - Landlord (especially ANL, BNL) has supported the institution's needs, but
 - Dollars have been eroded by inflation

Survey Questions and Responses

7 What is your position with regard to moving past the pilot state into regular usage of IGPP and IGPE?

- All 8 Labs indicated that would support adopting both
- Leaving IGPE as a pilot is a consideration
- Guidance needs to be provided (reporting, tracking, etc.)

8 If the contractor community adopts the pilot as normal business, do you support removing the G&A restriction on increasing rates?

- All 8 Labs indicated support to this question
- Make part of site determination

Survey Questions and Responses

9 Please provide any other comments regarding the use of IGPP and IGPE that you think will help FMSIC's efforts to address this issue.

- 2 Labs called out need to include capital and construction in base
- 1 Lab called for higher limits on GPP
- 2 Labs recommended FMSIC discuss this with Acting CFO
- IGPP seen as flexible, equitable, able to meet space and other needs, etc.

Comments

- Strict requirements for not raising G&A rates and not decreasing maintenance formed a barrier for at least one site.
- At some NNSA sites, IGPP is not viewed as being a pilot though there is a sunset provision.
- IGPE/IGPP seen as very useful in addressing infrastructure needs.
 - Landlord program may assign a lower priority.

Comments

- At least two sites have considered but not implemented IGPP.
- The merger of operating and capital funds by Congress makes IGPE and IGPE more feasible.
- Though it may not be strictly a CAS issue, IGPE and IGPP are a fair way to collect funds for infrastructure.

Comments

- It took relatively little effort to incorporate IGPE and IGPP into the Lab's financial systems, especially for the NNSA Labs.
 - All were already CAS compliant.
 - Wording of IGPP somewhat of a challenge.
- Comments from one or two Labs raised concern over additional DOE approval required for IGPP.
- Ability to set G&A rates based on site needs was seen as important by all Labs.